ら

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/001,435	10/31/2001	Min Zhu	16440.4015	2352·

34313 7590 04/03/2007 ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE, LLP IP PROSECUTION DEPARTMENT 4 PARK PLAZA SUITE 1600 IRVINE, CA 92614-2558	**EXAMINER** DIVECHA, KAMAL B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2151	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	04/03/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/001,435	ZHU ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	KAMAL B. DIVECHA	2151	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *16 March 2007*.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-37* is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-37* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

   1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
      Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
      Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-37 are pending in this application.

Claims 3-10, 13-27 were previously cancelled.

Claims 33-37 are newly added claims.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed March 16, 2007 with respect to claims 1-2, 11-12 and 28-31 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response filed, applicant argues in substance that:

a.   Claim is patentable because none of the cited references, either alone or in combination, discloses, teaches or suggests "enabling the remote computer to access an application on the target computer while the remote computer is participating in a data conference; and enabling the remote computer to share the application on the target computer with viewers participating in the data conference, wherein none of the viewers are located at the target computer (remarks, page 7).

In response to argument [a], Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Independent claim 1 recites:

> A method comprising:
> receiving a request to access a target computer from a remote computer at a central computer system, wherein the target computer includes a desktop;
> determining whether the remote computer has permission to access the resources on the target computer;
> enabling the remote computer to access the resources on the target computer if the remote computer has permission to access the resources on the target computer;
> enabling the remote computer to access an application on the target computer while the remote computer is participating in a data conference; and
> enabling the remote computer to share the application on the target computer with viewers participating in the data conference, wherein none of the viewers are located at the target device.

Claim 1 stands rejected as follows:

As per claim 1, Slaughter discloses a method comprising: receiving a request to access a target computer from a remote computer at a central computer system, wherein the target computer includes a desktop (col. 3 L10-52 and fig. 2 item #46, 48, 50); determining whether the remote computer has permission to access the resources on the target computer (fig. 3 step #57 and col. 3 L12-55); and enabling the remote computer to access the resources on the target computer if the remote computer has permission to access the resources on the target computer, wherein none of the viewers are located at the target computer (col. 3 L50-60, col. 5 L14-23, fig. 3 step #58 and fig. 2: viewers are users corresponding to external network which are not located within the LAN, thus, not located at the target computer).

However, Slaughter does not disclose the process of enabling the remote computer to access an application (i.e. a resource) on the target computer while the remote computer is participating in a data conference and enabling the remote computer to share the application on the target computer with viewers participating in the data conference.

RIDDLE, from the same field of endeavor explicitly discloses the process of enabling the remote computer to access an application on the target computer while the remote computer is participating in a data conference and enabling the remote computer to share the application on the target computer with viewers participating in the data conference (fig. 2, pg. 1 [0004], pg. 4 [0043], [0047], pg. 5 [0053-0056]).

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Slaughter in view of RIDDLE in order to enable the remote computer to access and share the application while in data conference (Slaughter discloses remote access system and RIDDLE discloses a web conferencing application for sharing data between conference participants).

One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because teleconferencing is increasingly becoming popular application, enabling the transfer of audio and video data between users so that they can communicate with each other and share data through the Internet (RIDDLE, pg. 1 [0004]).

Logically, the combination of Slaughter in view of Riddle clearly discloses the subject matter as in claim 1.

As described in the previous office action, the claimed invention is simply the combination of two well-known technologies such as data conferencing and remote accessing, which are well documented and available in the art.

Remote access enables a remote user, i.e. a user located anywhere in the world, to access and the target computer and its resources including applications, based on the user's privileges, as disclosed by Slaughter.

Data Conferencing enables the users to share and collaborate data and/or information among plurality of users, as disclosed by Riddle.

Implementing data conference capabilities of Riddle into Remote access services of Slaughter clearly suggests the process of "enabling the remote computer to access an application on the target computer while the remote computer is participating in a data conference; and enabling the remote computer to share the application on the target computer with viewers participating in the data conference, wherein non of the viewers are located at the target computer".

It seems like applicant is interpreting the references individually in order to distinguish the claimed invention over the prior art. Applicant is advised to interpret the claimed subject matter in view of the combination of the references.

For the at least these reasons, applicant arguments directed towards the distinction between the prior art and the claimed invention, based on the features above are considered not persuasive.

b.   In Riddle, members of a teleconference are able to share applications running on their computers with other members of the teleconference. This sharing allows a member to access applications residing on another members desktop (paragraph [0043]).

However, Riddle does not disclose a member of the teleconference remotely accessing an application on a target computer that is not a member of the teleconference, and sharing the application on the target computer with other members of the teleconference (remarks, page 8).

In response to argument [b], Examiner respectfully disagrees.

In response to applicant's argument that RIDDLE fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., member of the teleconference remotely accessing an application on a target computer that is not a member of the teleconference, and sharing the application on the target computer with other members of the teleconference) are not recited in the rejected claim(s).

Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

The fact that Applicant acknowledges that members of teleconference are able to share applications running on their computers with other members, when interpreted in view of remote access services of Slaughter, logically implies that the members of teleconference are able to share applications running on the target computer with other members of the data conference.

Therefore, applicant arguments directed towards the distinction between the prior art and the claimed invention, based on the features above are considered not persuasive.

c.   The claimed invention advantageously allows, e.g. a traveling business man in Paris to remotely access a Powerpoint presentation...This is not provided for in Riddle, which only provides sharing of applications one of the members computer (remarks, page 8).

In response to argument [c], Examiner disagrees.

First, although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

In this case, the claimed invention may be advantageous in its aspect; however, this advantage is not disclosed in the claims.

Secondly, the combination of Slaughter in view of Riddle does in fact provide the same advantage because the user can access the target computer from anywhere in the world, based on the remote access system, and further enables the user to conduct data conference with other users for sharing and collaborating data and/or information.

For the at least these reasons, applicant arguments directed towards the distinction between the prior art and the claimed invention, based on the features above are considered not persuasive.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 32 and 35-37 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection (see the rejection as presented herein).

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

1.   Claims 1, 2, 11, 12, 28-32 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-34 of U.S. Patent No. 6,691,154 B1 (issued to Zhu et al. of same assignee) in view of Slaughter, III et al. (hereinafter Slaughter, U. S. Patent No. 5,598,536).

As per claim 1, US Patent No. 6,691,154 discloses the process of automatically assigning control of the local computer system to the one or more remote computer systems in response to the one or more remote computers joining the data conference (i.e. a remote access or control

system), the one or more remote computer systems providing the technical support for the

identified application including controlling the desktop application on the local computer system

and <u>displaying the desktop of the local computer system at each remote computer system through

a respective viewer application during the data conference</u>, and wherein the desktop represents

the desktop of the local computer system.

However, US Patent No. 6,691,154 does not disclose the authentication process for

granting remote access to the local computer (i.e. receiving a request to access a target computer

from a remote computer, determining whether the remote computer has permission to access the

target computer; and enabling the remote computer to access the target computer if the remote

computer has the permission.

Slaughter, explicitly discloses the authentication process, i.e. receiving a request to access

the computer, determining whether the remote computer has permission to access the computer

and granting or denying the access based on the determination of whether the remote computer

has permission to access the computer (col. 3 L50-60, col. 5 L14-23, fig. 3 and fig. 2).

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time

the invention was made to modify US Patent No. 6,691,154 in view of Slaughter in order to

receive a request and determine the user rights to access the local network or target computer.

One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivate because it would have

provided a user authentication and security features (Slaughter, col. 2 L1-18).

Independent claim 11 is rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claim 1. Dependent

claims 2, 12, 28-32 are rejected for the at least reasons as set forth in claim 1.

Specification

The specification is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

The test to be applied under the written description portion of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, is whether the disclosure of the application as originally filed reasonably conveys to the artisan that the inventor had possession at that time of later claimed subject matter. Vas-Cat, Inc. v. Mahurkar, 935 F. 2d 1555, 1565, 19 USPQ2d 111, 1118 (Fed. Cir. 1991), reh'rg denied (Fed. Cir. July 8, 1991) and reh'rg, en banc, denied (Fed. Cir. July 29, 1991).

The applicants have failed to provide an enabling disclosure in the detailed description of the embodiment. The specification is objected to under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to support the subject matter set forth in these claims, i.e. lack of written description. See MPEP § 2163.

Claim 1 recites:

> A method comprising:
> receiving a request to access a target computer from a remote computer at a central computer system, wherein the target computer includes a desktop;
> determining whether the remote computer has permission to access the resources on the target computer;
> enabling the remote computer to access the resources on the target computer if the remote computer has permission to access the resources on the target computer;
> enabling the remote computer to access an application on the target computer while the remote computer is participating in a data conference; and
> enabling the remote computer to share the application on the target computer with viewers participating in the data conference, wherein none of the viewers are located at the target device.

However, the specification merely describes the data conferencing and remote accessing.

There is simply no support for the amendatory claim language, i.e. "wherein none of the viewers are located at the target device" in the originally filed specification.

Claim 34 recites:

> "The method of claim 1, further comprising enabling the remote computer to disable an input device of the target computer or make a screen of the target computer blank."

However, the specification merely describes the process wherein the user at the target computer selects the settings and/or options that includes disabling an input device of the target or make a screen f the target blank when the target computer is in data conferencing (specification, page 9 [0036-0037]).

There is no support for the amendatory claim language, i.e. "enabling the remote computer to disable..." in the originally filed specification.

Claim 35 recites:

> "The method of claim 1, further comprising enabling the remote computer to set up a user account on the central computer..."

However, the specification merely describes the process wherein the user at the target computer sets up an account on the central computer (specification, page 6 [0025] to page. 7 [0030] and pg. 7 [0031] to page 8 [0033]).

There is no support for the amendatory claim language, i.e. "enabling the remote computer to set up a user account on the central computer" in the originally filed specification.

A such, the above claimed limitations presents the subject matter situations and was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2.   Claims 1, 2, 11, 12, 28-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, for the same

reasons as set forth in specification above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3.   Claims 33-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for

failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as

the invention.

Claim 33 recites:

> The method of claim 1, further comprising:
> when the target computer is started, enabling the target computer to automatically initiate and establish a connection with the central computer; and
> enabling the remote computer to access the desktop of the target computer through the central computer.

In the context of this claim, the functionality of "when the target computer is started..." is

unclear. It is unclear whether the starting is with respect to user or an administrator, how, when

and under what situations the target computer is required starting or rebooting. Without these

elements, the claim fails to disclose metes and bounds of the subject matter.

Additionally, the claim is considered indefinite because claim 1, from which claim 33

depends, requires the remote user to obtain permission to access the target computer, however,

claim 33 teaches process wherein when the target computer is started, the target computer automatically initiates and establishes connection with the central computer and enables the remote computer to access the desktop of the target computer through the central computer.

It seems claim 33 either lacks an essential element(s) or step(s) and/or is incomplete, because if the subject matter in claim 33 operable, then claim 1 and the authentication process in claim 1 is not useful.

<u>Claim 35 recites:</u>

The method of claim 1, further comprising:
enabling the remote computer to... and
enabling the target computer to log onto the user account on the central computer and, while logged onto the user account, to download a remote access program from the central computer onto the target computer, wherein the remote access program enables the target computer to share the application with the remote computer via the central computer.

Claim 1, from which claim 35 depend, discloses the process of sharing application with remote computer via the central computer. This logically implies that the target computer is associated with the remote access program, however, claim 35 teaches the process of logging onto the user account and downloading the remote access program to share the application with the remote computer. If claim logically discloses the remote access program, then what is need for downloading the remote access program again?

The dependent claims seems to be improper due failure of further limiting the independent claim.

<u>Claim 37 recites:</u>

The method of claim 36, wherein the remote access program <u>enables a user at the target computer</u> to configure the remote access program to automatically connect the target computer to the central computer when the target computer is started or to connect the target computer to the central computer when the remote access program is manually launched on the target computer.

Claim 1, from which claim 37 indirectly depends, discloses the process wherein none of

the viewers are located at the target computer, i.e. none of the user are located at the target

computer, whereas, claim 37 discloses the process wherein the user at the target computer...

The subject matter in the claims is contradictory and therefore indefinite.

Claim 36 is rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claim 35.

Claim 37 is further rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claim 33.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the

claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various

claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any

evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out

the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later

invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c)

and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4.   Claims 1-2, 11-12, 28-30 and 33-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Slaughter, III et al. (hereinafter Slaughter, U. S. Patent No. 5,598,536) in view

RIDDLE (US 2003/0187924 A1).

As per claim 1, Slaughter discloses a method comprising: receiving a request to access a

target computer from a remote computer at a central computer system, wherein the target

computer includes a desktop (col. 3 L10-52 and fig. 2 item #46, 48, 50); determining whether the

remote computer has permission to access the resources on the target computer (fig. 3 step #57

and col. 3 L12-55); and enabling the remote computer to access the resources on the target

computer if the remote computer has permission to access the resources on the target computer,

wherein none of the viewers are located at the target computer (col. 3 L50-60, col. 5 L14-23, fig.

3 step #58 and fig. 2: viewers are users corresponding to external network which are not located within the LAN, thus, not located at the target computer).

However, Slaughter does not disclose the process of enabling the remote computer to access an application (i.e. a resource) on the target computer while the remote computer is participating in a data conference and enabling the remote computer to share the application on the target computer with viewers participating in the data conference.

RIDDLE, from the same field of endeavor explicitly discloses the process of enabling the remote computer to access an application on the target computer while the remote computer is participating in a data conference and enabling the remote computer to share the application on the target computer with viewers participating in the data conference (fig. 2, pg. 1 [0004], pg. 4 [0043], [0047], pg. 5 [0053-0056]).

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Slaughter in view of RIDDLE in order to enable the remote computer to access and share the application while in data conference (Slaughter discloses remote access system and RIDDLE discloses a web conferencing application for sharing data between conference participants).

One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because teleconferencing is increasingly becoming popular application, enabling the transfer of audio and video data between users so that they can communicate with each other and share data through the Internet (RIDDLE, pg. 1 [0004]).

As per claim 2, Slaughter discloses the process of allowing the remote computer to specify accessible applications (i.e. allowing the remote computer to access the accessible

applications) that are located on the target computer if the remote computer has permission to access the target computer (fig. 3 step #58 and step #64; col. 2 L19-31).

As per claim 11, Slaughter discloses a computer system including: a first computer and a second computer, each including a desktop (fig. 1 item #12 and fig. 2 item #46, col. 3 L10-52); a central server computer system communicatively accessible by the first and second computers (fig. 1 item #16, col. 3 L10-52), wherein the central server computer system is configured to enable a computer to share control of another computer (i.e. access another computer system) via a global computer network and is further configured to determine whether the computer has permission to share control of the another computer (fig. 1 and col. 1 L63 to col. 2 L18); a first computer program installed on the first computer and configured to send a request to the central server computer system to access and control the second computer and further configured to enable the first computer to access and control the second computer (col. 5 L56-67 and col. 3 L13-60; Applicant Admitted Prior Art, AAPA para. [0003]); and a second computer program installed on the second computer and configured o receive a request from the central server computer system to access and control the second computer and further configured to enable the first computer to access and control the second computer (AAPA para. [0001-0003]; col. 6 L23-64 and fig. 3).

However, Slaughter does not disclose the process of enabling the remote computer to access an application (i.e. a resource) on the target computer while the remote computer is participating in a data conference hosted by the service provider and enabling the remote computer to share the application on the target computer with viewers participating in the data conference.

RIDDLE, from the same field of endeavor explicitly discloses the process of enabling the

remote computer to access an application on the target computer while the remote computer is

participating in a data conference and enabling the remote computer to share the application on

the target computer with viewers participating in the data conference.

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time

the invention was made to modify Slaughter in view of RIDDLE in order to enable the remote

computer to access and share the application while in data conference.

One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because of the same reasons

as set forth in claim 1.

As per claim 28, Slaughter discloses a system wherein the first and second computer

programs are remote access programs (col. 5 L57 to col. 6 L31; AAPA para. [0003]).

As per claim 29, Slaughter discloses a system wherein remote access programs are

downloaded from the central server computer system (col. 6 L20-30 and fig. 1-2).

As per claim 30, Slaughter discloses a system wherein the central server computer system

includes a web server (col. 6 L10-31).

As per claim 33, Slaughter in view of RIDDLE discloses enabling the remote computer

to access the desktop of the target computer through the central computer (col. 3 L50-60, col. 5

L14-23, fig. 3 step #58 and fig. 2).

However, Slaughter in view of RIDDLE does not disclose the process comprising when

the target computer is started, enabling the target computer to automatically initiate and establish

a connection with the central computer.

But, the fact that whenever computer is started and/or restarted in a LAN such as the LAN in figure 1 of Slaughter, the target computer automatically initiates and establishes the connection with the central server, is obvious in the art (for example: whenever a computer in a LAN environment of a firm, organization and/or company is restarted, it will automatically initiate and establish the connection with the central server of a firm).

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Slaughter in view of RIDDLE (if necessary) in order to enable the target computer to automatically initiate and establish the connection with the central server.

One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated so that the remote access can be achieved (Slaughter, col. 1 L62 to col. 2 L55).

As per claim 34, Slaughter hints the process of remote control wherein a user dials-in to the local network with the remote computer and takes control of a local computer on the network (col. 5 L10-24).

However, Slaughter does not disclose the process of enabling the remote computer to disable an input device of the target computer or make a screen of the target computer blank.

But, the process of remote control in the art is well documented and widely available in the art, as evidenced by Slaughter. In a remote control system, the user can disable an input device of the local computer or make screen computer blank and can further perform many tasks).

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Slaughter in order to enable the remote computer to disable an input device of the target computer.

One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated so that the remote user can

control the local computer (Slaughter, col. 5 L11-24).

As per claim 12, it does not teach or further define over the limitations in claims 1-2, 11

and 28-30. Therefore claim 12 is rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claims 1-2, 11 and

28-30.

5.   Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Slaughter, III et

al. (hereinafter Slaughter, U. S. Patent No. 5,598,536) in view of RIDDLE (US 2003/0187924

A1), and further in view of Easley et al. (hereinafter Easley, Pub. No.: US 2002/0142842 A1).

As per claim 31, Slaughter in view of RIDDLE does not disclose a system wherein the

first and second computer programs are software plug-ins downloadable from a website.

Easley, from the same field of endeavor discloses a system wherein software (plug-ins or

other applications) is downloaded from a server (a website, pg. 3 [0028] and fig. 1).

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time

the invention was made to modify Slaughter in view of RIDDLE and further in view of Easley,

in order to download the computer programs as software plug-ins from a website.

One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because it would have

enabled a user to access the software applications through a website (Easley, [0028]).

6.   Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Slaughter, III et

al. (hereinafter Slaughter, U. S. Patent No. 5,598,536) in view RIDDLE (US 2003/0187924 A1),

and further in view of Jordan (US 2001/0050984 A1).

As per claim 32, Slaughter in view of RIDDLE does not disclose the process wherein in

response to a user at the remote computer attempting to access the target computer, accessing a

stored telephone number from the target computer; dialing the telephone number to call a user at

the remote computer; comparing the numeric identification code to a stored numeric

identification code and allowing the remote computer to access the target computer if the

received numeric identification code matches the stored identification code (i.e. phone

authentication).

Jordan, from the same field of endeavor discloses the process wherein in response to a

user at the remote computer attempting to access the target computer, accessing a stored

telephone number from the database (if the central exchange system can retrieve data from the

database, it is also capable of retrieving data from the target computer), dialing the telephone

number to call a user at the remote computer, comparing the numeric identification code to a

stored numeric identification code and allowing the remote computer to access the target

computer if the numeric code matches the stored numeric code (fig. 1, fig. 2, fig. 3, pg. 1 [0010-

0015], pg. 3 [0033-0038], pg. 4 [0039-0047]: phone authentication).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time

the invention was made to modify Slaughter in view of RIDDLE and further in view of Jordan in

order to determine whether the remote computer has permission to access the target computer

through phone authentication.

One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because it would have prevented fraud and/or unauthorized access to services using the telephone authentication (Jordan, pg. 1 [0002]).

7.   Claims 35-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Slaughter, III et al. (hereinafter Slaughter, U. S. Patent No. 5,598,536) in view RIDDLE (US 2003/0187924 A1), and further in view of Riggins et al. (hereinafter Riggins, US 6,131,116).

As per claim 35, Slaughter in view of RIDDLE discloses the remote access programs enabling the target computer to share the applications with the remote computer via the central computer (fig. 1, fig. 3, col. 3 L11 to col. 4 L47, col. 5 L55-67).

However, Slaughter in view of RIDDLE does not disclose the process of enabling the remote computer to set up a user account on the central computer and enabling the target computer to log onto the user account on the central computer and while logged onto the user account, to download a remote access program from the central computer onto the target computer.

Riggins discloses the process of logging onto the user account on the central computer to download configuration data and applets from the central computer (fig. 1, fig. 6 item #610, 620, 640, fig. 7, col. 6 L37 to col. 7 L35, col. 8 L45-67: in order for the user to access the services provided by the master server and the fact that user access privileges are confirmed by the server implies that the user must have set up an account with the master server).

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Slaughter and RIDDLE in view of Riggins in order to download the remote access programs to the target computer.

One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated because the remote access program would have provided remote access to the local computer network (Slaughter, col. 1 L61 to col. 2 L55).

As per claim 36, Slaughter in view of RIDDLE discloses enabling the remote computer to access the desktop of the target computer through the central computer (col. 3 L50-60, col. 5 L14-23, fig. 3 step #58 and fig. 2).

However, Slaughter in view of RIDDLE does not disclose the process comprising when the target computer is started, enabling the target computer to automatically initiate and establish a connection with the central computer.

But, the fact that whenever computer is started and/or restarted in a LAN such as the LAN in figure 1 of Slaughter, the target computer automatically initiates and establishes the connection with the central server, is obvious in the art (for example: whenever a computer in a LAN environment of a firm, organization and/or company is restarted, it will automatically initiate and establish the connection with the central server of a firm).

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Slaughter in view of RIDDLE (if necessary) in order to enable the target computer to automatically initiate and establish the connection with the central server.

One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated so that the remote access can be achieved (Slaughter, col. 1 L62 to col. 2 L55).

As per claim 37, Slaughter does not disclose the process wherein the remote access program enables a user to connect the target computer to the central computer when the remote access program is manually launched on the target computer.

However, the fact that the remote access program when manually launched enables the user to connect the target computer to the central computer is obvious (in other words, the launching of remote access program does connect the computer to the central computer and/or is for connecting the computer to the central computer for remote access).

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Slaughter in order to manually launch the remote access program to connect the target computer to the central computer.

One of ordinary skilled in the art would have been motivated for the same reasons as set forth in claim 36.

Additional References

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

a.   Fuh et al., U. S. Patent No. 6,463,474: Local Authentication of a client at a network device.

b.   Dorfman et al., U. S. Patent No. 6,449,651 B1: Temporary Remote Access to a computer.

c.   Watson et al., U. S. Patent No. 5,475,839: Method and Structure for securing access to a computer system.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KAMAL B. DIVECHA whose telephone number is 571-272-5863. The examiner can normally be reached on Increased Flex Work Schedule.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zarni Maung can be reached on 571-272-3939. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Kamal Divecha
Art Unit 2151
March 26, 2007.

ZARNI MAUNG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER